DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 269 AC 014 453

AUTHOR	Divita, Charles, Jr., Ed.; And Others
TITLE	An Evaluation of the Rural Community Assistance Consortium (June 1971 through September 1972).
INSTITUTION	Action Research Corp., Tallahassee, Fla.; National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Atlanta, Ga. Office for Advancement of Public Negro Colleges.
PUB DATE	14 Feb 73
NOTE	82p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Resources; *Community Service Programs; *Consortia; Human Resources; Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Negro Colleges; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Rural Development; Rural Extension

ABSTRACT

The Rural Community Assistance Consortium (RCAC) was established to increase member schools' ability to attract and maintain funded programs and qualified resource personnel to upgrade human and community resources in rural areas. The RCAC consists of 15 predominantly black land-grant colleges and Tuskegee Institute in 15 southern and border States. Methodology includes: (1) periodic conferences, consultation, and on-site visits; (2) training programs and technical assistance in submitting funding proposals; (3) developing and organizing programs for the rural poor; and (4) collecting, analyzing and disseminating information to consortium members. Social survey and case study techniques were used to acquire needed information pertaining to problems, needs and program efficacy. The actual evaluation was performed by consultants who visited the consortium schools to interview officials and analyze the institution's rural community development efforts. The evaluation and recommendations deal with organization and staffing, community services, institutional impact and community impact. A summary of the attitudinal data of RCAC is provided in an appendix. (KM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 078269

AN EVALUATION OF THE RURAL COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE CONSORTIUM

(JUNE 1971 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 1972)

OFFICE FOR ADVANCEMENT OF PUBLIC NEGRO COLLEGES,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES
AND LAND GRANT COLLEGES

AN INDEPENDENT APPRAISAL
BY

ACTION RESEARCH CORPORATION, INC.
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

EDITED BY:

DR. CHARLES DIVITA, JR.
MS. ERNESTINE B. BOCLAIR
DR. GEORGE F. AKER

FEBRUARY 14, 1973

AC014453

AN EVALUATION OF THE RURAL COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE CONSORTIUM

(June 1971 through September 1972)

OFFICE FOR ADVANCEMENT OF PUBLIC NEGRO COLLEGES,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES
AND LAND GRANT COLLEGES

Edited by:

Dr. Charles Divita, Jr.
Ms. Ernestine B. Boclair
Dr. George F. Aker

February 14, 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CONSORTIUM-WIDE OVERVIEW AND EVALUATION OF RCAC

A. Introduction to RCAC. 2

Rationale
Purpose
Methodology
Constituency
Personnel

B. Evaluation Design and Methodology . . . 12

Design
Methodology

C. Presentation and Analysis of Data . . . 15

Organization and Staffing
RCAC Central Level
Structure
Manpower
Communication

Institutional Level
Structure
Manpower
Communication

RCAC Services

Institutional Impact of RCAC

Community Impact of RCAC

D. Conclusions and Recommendations 58

Conclusions
Recommendations

E. Appendix. 78

Summary of Attitudinal Data on RCAC

CONSORTIUM-WIDE OVERVIEW AND EVALUATION OF RCAC

A. INTRODUCTION TO RCAC

The Rural Community Assistance Consortium (RCAC) was established "to increase the demonstrable capabilities of its member schools to attract and maintain funded programs and qualified resource personnel as aids to upgrading human and community resources in rural areas."

The primary delivery system established to acnieve this broad purpose relies upon the use of technical consultants and staff development conferences for the faculty, staff, students and/or administrative representatives of 16 member institutions. In addition, travel assistance and other services (i.e., personal conferences) are provided by the central office to assist member institutions in their efforts to attract the funds and staff resources required to effectively relate the resources of the university or college to the identification and resolution of significant problems throughout the various communities which they purport to serve.

Rationale

The need for this project developed from the recognition that the exceeding complex, interrelated, and critical problems of today (i.e., poverty, alienation,

undereducation, social disorganization, unemployment, environmental abuse, delinquency and crime, and inadequate standards of health, nutrition and living, etc.) are man-made problems--subject to manmade solutions.

It was further recognized that colleges and universities (especially Land Grant Colleges) have a social and public responsibility to mobilize the resources of their various disciplines in the social, behavioral and natural sciences, in the arts and humanities, and in their professional schools (education, medicine, social work, agriculture, business, nursing, engineering, law, etc.) and bring them to bear upon the crucial social, economic and environmental problems aluded to above.

Within the Land Grant institutions, the colleges of agriculture and related life sciences, with their experiment stations for R&D and their coordinated efforts with the Cooperative Extension Service for application and planned change, have been highly successful in solving the technical problems of agricultural production, processing and distribution, etc.. This success has been partially--though significantly--responsible for the transformation of this country from a rural to an urban economy, for mass migration from rural to urban areas, for providing innovations and technologies which have been exported around the world and which have revolutionized the development of developing nations. This success has also had its greatest impact

upon the middle-class and middle to upper income group in our rural areas.

Problems of reaching and helping the rural poor, the technologically displaced, the seasonal farm workers, the tenant farmers, the sharecroppers, the migrant workers, and the low income non-farm and small town populations have defied the traditional methods and technologies created through the Experiment Stations and Cooperative Extension Services of Land Grant Colleges. Similarly, the same institutions, through their General Extension Divisions and/or Offices of Continuing Education and Community Services, have been relatively ineffective in bringing the resources of the total university to bear upon the critical problems of the times.

The problems faced by higher education in translating and directing its interdisciplinary resources to the complex problems of the off-campus environment and in designing education for maximum impact at the community level are magnified in the case of the smaller institutions, especially the relatively small, predominately Black Land Grant Institutions. Ironically, it is these same institutions which have the highest potential for reaching the people, the problems and the needs in the rural areas which surround them.

Purpose

As a consequence of the above, RCAC was established to provide a base for institutional staff development, for

bringing about reordering of institutional priorities, for changing attitudes at times, and for helping institutions identify and obtain the financial resources required to develop, test, and implement programs to effectively upgrade, constructively change, and significantly improve the totality of rural America. As such, RCAC was intended to alleviate the following problems:

1. The lack of any organized and coordinated program among institutions invited to form the consortium for sharing information on program activities and techniques aimed at the development of human resources of rural disadvantaged residents.

2. The lack of sufficient knowledge by consortium faculty and administrative personnel on available sources of financial support for the services rendered by Black Land Grant Colleges to disadvantaged residents in rural areas.

3. The lack of sufficient technical knowledge and skills by faculty and administrative personnel at Black Land Grant Colleges in the development of funding proposals and grant management procedures.

With the above problems in mind, RCAC sought to demonstrate that:

1. Given the opportunity and technical and financial assistance the predominantly Black Land Grant Colleges have the capabilities to develop and implement major programs in human resource development.

2. Providing grants to institutions currently servicing rural residents will result in more appropriate programs and services aimed at meeting the needs of the rural disadvantaged.

3. Funding support for rural community programs at the Black Land Grant Colleges will have the effect of upgrading the living conditions of poor people in rural communities.

4. Success with funding proposals and technical assistance programs will increase rural community

involvement of both faculty and students at consortium institutions.

5. Providing training and technical assistance to consortium representatives will result in a greater number of funding proposals developed and submitted to appropriate funding agencies.

6. Providing training and technical assistance to consortium representatives will result in a geometric increase in the number of training programs and grants secured.

7. Consortium activities will result in the attraction of more qualified personnel to work on the staff of consortium institutions.

8. Training and technical assistance will have the effect of strengthening the quality and breadth of curricula offerings at these institutions.

9. Training and technical assistance will increase consortium members' competency to form consulting type research firms.

Methodology

The specific methodologies employed by RCAC as means to obtain its desired ends included the following:

1. Periodic conferences, consultative services, and on-site field visits by training and technical assistance personnel.

2. Training programs and technical assistance to consortium members on techniques in developing and submitting funding proposals.

3. Developing and organizing programs which provide supportive services for the rural poor.

4. Collecting, analyzing and disseminating pertinent information from consortium members and the remaining NASULGC institutions to consortium members.

Constituency

The Rural Community Assistance Consortium (RCAC) consists of fifteen predominately Black land-grant colleges and Tuskegee Institute. The sixteen institutions, ranging in size from 1,100 to slightly more than 11,000 are located in 15 southern and border states extending from Delaware to Texas. The participating institutions, their locations, and presidents are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS, LOCATIONS, AND PRESIDENTS, 1971-72

College	City	State	President
Alabama A&M University	Huntsville	Alabama	Dr. R. D. Morrison
Alcorn A&M College	Lorman	Mississippi	Dr. Walter Washington
Arkansas AM&N College	Pine Bluff	Arkansas	Dr. L. A. Davis
Delaware State College	Dover	Delaware	Dr. Luna I. Mishoe
Florida A&M University	Tallahassee	Florida	Dr. B. L. Perry
Fort Valley State College	Fort Valley	Georgia	Dr. W. W. E. Blanchet
Kentucky State University	Frankfort	Kentucky	Dr. Carl M. Hill

TABLE 1.--Continued

College	City	State	President
Langston University	Langston	Oklahoma	Dr. W. E. Sims
Lincoln University	Jefferson City	Missouri	Dr. Walter Daniel
North Carolina A&T State University	Greensboro	North Carolina	Dr. L. C. Dowdy
Prairie View A&M College	Prairie View	Texas	Dr. Alvin I. Thomas
South Carolina State College	Orangeburg	South Carolina	Dr. M. M. Nance
Southern University	Baton Rouge	Louisiana	Dr. G. L. Netterville
Tennessee State University	Nashville	Tennessee	Dr. A. P. Torrence
Tuskegee Institute	Tuskegee	Alabama	Dr. L. H. Foster
Virginia State College	Petersburg	Virginia	Dr. W. P. Russell

Personnel

The RCAC central office human resources consist of Dr. Haywood Strickland, Director of RCAC, Mr. Roy H. Kennix, Assistant Director, Miss Mattie Rogers, and Miss Elizabeth

Moane. It should be noted that the present Director of RCAC as well as the Assistant Director joined the staff after the period covered by this evaluation. These individuals work closely with Dr. Herman B. Smith, Jr., Director of the Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges (OAPNC) of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC). Since RCAC central is "housed organizationally and administratively within OAPNC," it works in a coordinated and complementary fashion with both OAPNC and NASULGC.

In addition to the RCAC central staff, each participating institution in the consortium has identified a campus representative to serve as a liaison, coordinator and contact between RCAC central and the consortium college. Generally, these individuals were selected on the basis of the extent of congruence between their ongoing responsibilities to the institution and the objectives of RCAC. Of the 16 participating institutions, 13 had one RCAC representative and 3 nad two such individuals. None of these persons receive direct remuneration from RCAC for their time and services. Thus the project has a significant cost-sharing factor operative. The regular institutional responsibilities of the RCAC representatives cluster in the following manner:

5 - Directors of Research (including Special Projects)
4 - Departments of Agriculture/Cooperative Extension
2 - Vice Presidents or Assistants to the President
3 - Directors of Development
2 - Directors of other funded projects and programs
3 - Other

The RCAC campus representatives, their titles and their institutions are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

RCAC CAMPUS REPRESENTATIVES

Institutions	Name	Department	Telephone
Alabama A&M University Normal, Ala. 35762	Dr. James I. Dawson	Dept. of Agriculture	205-859-0800
Alcorn A&M College Lorman, Miss. 39096	Dr. William C. Boykin	Director, Institutional Research	605-877-3711
Arkansas AM&N University at Pine Bluff, Ark.71601	Dr. R. C. Davis	Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs	501-535-6700
Delaware State College Dover, Delaware 19901	Mr. Marion Mendenhall	Director, Institutional Research	302-678-5155
Fort Valley State College Fort Valley, Ga. 31030	Dr. Oliver Robinson Mr. Rufus Ragin	Dept. of Business & Ec. Director of Development	912-825-8281
Florida A&M University Tallahassee, Fla.32307	Dr. Rupert G. Seals	Dean, Sch. of Agri. & Home Economics	904-222-8030
Kentucky State Univ. Frankfort, Ky. 40601	Dr. Frank Bean Dr. Alpha Jones	Director of Development Director, Cooperative Extension Services Prog.	502-564-5922 502-564-6586
Langston University Langston, Okla. 73050	Dr. S. B. Lattener	Dept. of Agriculture	405-466-2281

TABLE 2.--Continued

Institutions	Name	Department	Telephone
Lincoln University Jefferson City, Mo. 65101	Mr. Edward Taylor	Director, Institutional Research	314-635-8171
N. C. A&T State Univ. Greensboro, N.C. 27411	Mr. Sampson Buie	Community Relations Specialist	919-379-7500
Prairie View A&M College Prairie View, Texas 77445	Dr. Ivory Nelson	Director, Research and Special Project	713-857-3311
S. C. State College Orangeburg, S.C.29115	Dr. R. L. Hurst	Director, Research, Planning & Development	803-534-6560
Southern University Baton Rouge, La. 70813	Dr. T. T. Williams	Asst. to the President	504-771-4680
Tennessee State Univ. Nashville, Tenn. 37203	Dr. James Farrell	Director, Office of Continuing Education	
	Mr. James Lemons	Director, Lazy Susan Project	615-329-9500
Virginia State College Petersburg, Va. 23806	Mr. William Terry	Director of Development	703-526-5111
Tuskegee Institute Tuskegee, Ala. 36088	Dr. Theodore J. Pinnock	Director, Human Resources Development Center	205-727-8011

B. EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Design

The evaluation was designed to provide both "hard" and "soft" data reflecting the accomplishment of objectives and effectiveness of methods, techniques and processes at the project, institutional and community levels.

Social survey and case study techniques were employed to acquire needed information pertaining to problems, needs and program efficacy. Originally, a 50% random sample of the 16 institutional members of the Consortium was to have been taken to provide the basis for case studies and in-depth interviews of selected members of the faculties, student bodies, and administrative staff of the member institutions. However, RCAC preferred that the total universe of Institutions be studied in lieu of a sample, thus, all 16 institutions were involved in the effort.

Records of various activities available at all member institutions were examined and used in determining various quantitative and qualitative aspects of the project.

These measures were used to verify and supplement data collected through questionnaires administered to selected samples of program administrators and faculty within the member institutions, and by means of depth interviews within the institutions.

These data were used to identify crucial problems and needs, document noteworthy accomplishments and provide interpretive data useful in determining why certain efforts are more successful than others, why some methods yield success whereas others fail to do so, and the effect of various attitudes on program effectiveness.

Every effort was made to provide descriptive baseline data on past and present program accomplishments and activities so that future evaluations could utilize and build upon data thus obtained in determining progress, lack of progress or change through time.

Conclusions were drawn as to why the program is or is not succeeding as originally planned and recommendations were developed as suggested ways of improving and strengthening the project. Implications for modified activities, new strategies for coordinating interdisciplinary efforts, and innovative methods for staff training and proposal development are discussed in this report as they have relevance to the Project, to the members of the consortium, to faculty and staff and to funding agencies.

Methodology

The actual evaluation itself was accomplished via the use of a number of highly competent individuals with respect to evaluation and rural community development. These consultants were charged with on-campus visitations with the various consortium schools in order to interview relevant

officials and collect and analyze available documents pertinent to the institution's rural community development thrust, specifically as it related to RCAC.

Where feasible the major consultant was also accompanied by another well experienced team member. With respect to the latter every effort was made to select an individual who was uniquely acquainted with the region within which the visited institution existed.

A list of the major consultants, their institutions and the consortium college(s) they visited appears below:

Dr. John Peters University of Tennessee	Kentucky State Tennessee State Lincoln University
Dr. Curtis Ulmer University of Georgia	Fort Valley
Dr. Donald Seaman Texas A & M	Prairie View
Dr. McKinley Martin Coahoma Junior College Mississippi	Arkansas Alabama A & M Alcorn Tuskegee Southern
Dr. Charles Divita Florida International University	Langston North Carolina A and M South Carolina State
Dr. Ronald Sheron Virginia Commonwealth University	Virginia State Delaware State
Ms. Ernestine B. Boclair Florida State University	Florida A & M

C. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Organization and Staffing

RCAC Central Level

Structure.--As noted earlier RCAC Central functions out of the Office for the Advancement for Public Negro Colleges (OAPNC) and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC). In the opinion of the evaluators, this is the most logical and complementary location for the RCAC project. This organizational arrangement, on the one hand, helps keep RCAC abreast of activities in Black land grant colleges whether they be related or unrelated to community development type activities. It also provides RCAC with some additional manpower, in the form of OAPNC staff, to orient people in the field about the existence of an RCAC project. Likewise, OAPNC personnel can serve and have served as additional liaison and support personnel to provide feedback to the RCAC Central staff. In the opinion of the evaluators, this organizational arrangement is indeed an optimal one. In fact, if RCAC were not housed within OAPNC, it is difficult to imagine how the project would have accomplished all that it has to date.

As far as fiscal responsibility is concerned, absolutely no instances and suggestions of mismanagement of funds were

noted as the evaluation team visited with the consortium members. The following excerpt taken from a report to the Office of Economic Opportunity (the grantor) reflects that RCAC has instituted appropriate practices for maintaining this status.

> The annual audit of financial expenditures for RCAC was conducted on July 14, 1972. The audit, made by Haskins and Sells, Certified Public Accountants, covered the period from June 10, 1971 (date of award) to June 30, 1972. During the stated period, $90,199 was spent. The Consortium is operating under a two-year grant of $290,000 which will permit effective utilization of remaining funds for viable program objectives beneficial to member institutions. Copies of the annual auditor's report, a Balance Sheet, Statement of Income and Expenditures, budget report, and a Grantee Quarterly Financial Report on program expenditures are included in this report as attachments.

Manpower.--As for the staffing pattern of RCAC Central itself, there is every indication that the staff should be expanded considerably. Every institution visited concurred with this recommendation. Interviewees were asked to respond to the following statements: the Central RCAC staff should be expanded so that more effective liaison can be established between it and member institutions. On an attitude scale ranging from 1 through 5 (with 5 indicating strong agreement and 1 indicating strong disagreement), the value calculated in response to the previous statement was established at 4.3. It appears that RCAC Central does not have sufficient quantity of manpower to maintain an optimal level of contact with the consortium members. Interviewees felt that the Central RCAC staff needed to be more aggressive

in stimulating member consortium colleges to make more requests of RCAC's services and resources. With the present staffing pattern, it is reasonable to suppose that RCAC will not be able to respond to such feelings among the individuals within the consortium colleges because of severe staff limitations. It should be noted here that of those institutions that had contact with RCAC staff members, a high level of regard was held for the quality of the RCAC Central staff's input.

Communication.--With regard to the matter of communication, respondents agreed (3.9) that communication between Central RCAC staff and the local consortium schools was sufficiently open and regular.

This indicates that the Central RCAC staff may perhaps be maintaining an adequate level of liaison with some institutions, but that that level of liaison maintenance could be enhanced, and that the nature of the liaison activity should be dealing with how RCAC can specifically relate to a given institution's problems and potentials.

The inference here is that RCAC makes sufficient contact with some consortium colleges, but there is sometimes failure for that contact to result in decisions with respect to specific activities which might be initiated.

In the words of one respondent, "RCAC needs to beat the bushes more to get some of the people excited about initiating projects on their campuses; just visiting and discussing what has happened in the past will not do. We need to get down to specifics."

It is significant to note that a previous statement reported that adequate liaison was being maintained with some colleges. Responses from approximately one fourth of the colleges indicated that officials were either undecided or dissatisfied with the frequency and level of communication they had with RCAC. This problem is no doubt correlated with the expressed belief that RCAC is undermanned at its central office.

Another factor relating to communication at the project Central levels involves RCAC's advisory committee. RCAC, because of its association with NASULGC has the fortune of securing the services of OAPNC as a project advisory committee. This committee meets twice yearly and has taken action by forming an ad hoc committee on Rural Development to specifically offer guidance to the Director of RCAC. Members of the Advisory Committee for 1971-72 were:

Dr. G. Leon Netterville, President of Southern University (Louisiana), Chairman

Dr. Willard L. Boyd, President of University of Iowa

Dr. Charles L. Hayes, President of Albany State (Georgia)

Dr. M. Maceo Nance, President of South Carolina State College

Dr. Lionel O. Pellegrin, Director of Continuing Education, Louisiana State University

Dr. Benjamin L. Perry, President of Florida A & M University

Mr. Michael Radock, Vice President for University Relations and Development, University of Michigan

Dr. Wendell P. Russell, President of Virginia State College

Dr. A. I. Thomas, President of Prairie View A & M College

Dr. Levi Watkins, President of Alabama State University

Dr. Albert N. Whiting, President of North Carolina Central University

The ex-officio members of the Advisory Committee were:

Dr. E. Laurence Chalmers, Jr., Chancellor of The University of Kansas

Mr. Edwin Crawford, Vice-President for Public Affairs, University of Virginia

Mr. Garven Hudgins, Director of the Office of Research and Information, NASULGC

Dr. David Mathews, President of The University of Alabama

The Ad Hoc Committee on Rural Development consisted of:

Dr. Alvin I. Thomas, Chairman

Dr. Willard L. Boyd

Dr. E. Laurence Chalmers, Jr.

Dr. Charles L. Hayes

Dr. Ralph K. Huitt, Executive Director of NASULGC (ex-officio)

Dr. B. L. Perry

Dr. Lionel Pellegrin

Dr. Herman B. Smith, Jr. (ex-officio).

Also attending the Ad Hoc Committee meeting were:

Ken Harney, OEO Program Manager

Roscoe Scott, Rural Development Specialist and RCAC campus representative, Prairie View A & M College (Texas)

The Director of RCAC attended each of the quarterly meetings of the Executive Committee of NASULGC with the exception of the Spring, 1972 meeting. An opportunity was

afforded to apprise this body of progress being made in RCAC. The Executive Committee, and especially the Executive Director was a firm supporter of the Project throughout the year. In the Spring, 1972 meeting of the Committee it voted unanimously to request to OEO the refunding of the project for an additional year beyond its assured two-year tenure.

The type of involvement of the Central RCAC staff emanating from their relationship with the above persons can only serve to greatly multiply its communications efforts and enhance implementation of the project. Few projects have been blessed with such a comprehensive, knowledgeable, relevant, and facilitative advisory committee.

Still another dimension of RCAC Central's communication efforts entails its public relations efforts. The following excerpts from an in-house RCAC report describes some of the major features of its public relations activities.

> A press conference was held in conjunction with the initial orientation meeting of the Consortium on June 28, 1971, at the Hilton Inn, Atlanta, Georgia. National educational and governmental dignitaries, as well as the Governor of Georgia, Jimmy Carter, shared in launching the project. Radio, television, and press coverage locally and nationally was given to the event. The June, 1971, issue of the Advancement Newsletter, a publication of the Office for Advancement of Public Negro Colleges, was devoted to the establishment of the Consortium. A brochure, "Facts About RCAC," was developed and distributed mid-year as an aid to stimulating fuller utilization by faculty, staff and students associated with member institutions. One hundred copies were sent to campus representatives for circulation designed to increase Consortium awareness. The majority of the inquiries received pertaining to

the program were from professors who sought direct grants from RCAC to aid in departmental efforts to go into communities. "Rural Development--A Challenge for the 1890 Colleges," a concept paper was developed and distributed to member schools and selected agencies, and individuals. The October, 1971, issue of Opportunity, a magazine produced by the Public Affairs Division of the Office of Economic Opportunity, carried an article about the Consortium, "Black Colleges Combine to Aid the Rural Poor."

In addition to the above references other newspaper and newsletter articles have furthered the public's awareness of RCAC. Likewise an undeterminable number of similar articles and reports have been written by the various consortium institutions and the variously affected rural communities. All of these efforts are no doubt having positive effects toward enhancing the public's and "significant others" awareness of and understanding of RCAC. There would seem to be a need for some type of coordination role to be played by RCAC to unify and make more deliberative the diversified public information efforts now operative and to plan subsequent ones.

Finally, another dimension of RCAC Central which relates to communication (as well as to project implementation) concerns its relationship with various local, state, and national groups and organizations. This involvement has been and continues to be at a very high level. Such activities are most significant and, in fact, are essential if the project's full potential is to be realized. These contacts can only serve to facilitate accomplishment of the project's objectives and enhance efficiency of operation. Illustrative

of the interagency contacts which RCAC Central has established is the following excerpt taken from an in-house RCAC report. The following represents some of the planning conferences, meetings attended, Consortium representation, and other contacts by the Director during the first program year:

1. RCAC Travel by Director - 57

   A. To RCAC Institutions - 36
   (including at least one visit to each of the 16 Consortium schools)

   B. To other NASULGC institutions in search of potential consultants - 3

   Cornell University
   Florida State University
   Pennsylvania State University

   C. To Washington, D. C. for consultation with federal agencies - 11

   D. Other travel in behalf of the Consortium - 7

2. Consortium Representation

   A. Director represented RCAC as a resource person to the following:

   -National Task Force on Welfare-Child Care - OEO

   -U. S. Department of Agriculture Workshop for 1890 Liaison Staff Officers

   -Planning Meetings (2), USDA Extension and Research officials and 1890 Land-grant Institutions

   -National Advisory Committee to the Secretary on Discrimination in Youth and Economics Programs, USDA

   -Institute for the Acquisition and Utilization of Excess and Surplus Government Property for 1890 Institutions, OEO, OE, and USDA

   -Animal, Plant, and Health Sciences Seminar on "Communication with the Neglected Farmers."

-Planning Meetings (2), Conference for Rural Leaders and Community Workers, Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

B. Director developed statements for government legislative bodies which affect allocations to RCAC institutions, as requested - 4

-U. S. Senate Sub-Committee on Rural Development, Tifton, Georgia, July 9, 1971

-U. S. Congress Appropriations Sub-Committee on Agriculture, Environmental and Consumer Protection, April 10, 1972

-U. S. Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, April 19, 1972

-U. S. Senate Sub-Committee on Migratory Labor, June 20, 1972

3. Miscellaneous

A. Maintained continuing contact with representatives of the following agencies:

-Office of Economic Opportunity

-U. S. Department of Labor (Rural Manpower)

-U. S. Department of Agriculture

-U. S. Office of Education

-Federation of Southern Cooperatives

-U. S. Senate Sub-Committee on Rural Development

-U. S. Department of Commerce (Economic Development Administration and Office for Minority Business Enterprises)

-Technical Assistance Consortium to Improve College Services (TACTICS)

-Regional Federal Offices - Atlanta

-Regional Federal Offices - Dallas

-Executive Systems Corporation, Washington, D. C.

Institutional Level

Structure.--The RCAC thrust at the institutional level appears to emanate from a variety of organizational patterns. These patterns cluster in one of three categories:

(1) in Divisions of Institutional Research, Development and/or Special projects;

(2) in on-going related projects being managed by the host institution (i.e., Tuskegee's Human Resources Development Center); or

(3) in academic departments (agriculture, business, economics) and other university divisions (i.e., continuing education).

All of these "organizational houses" for the institutional level RCAC thrust appear to be philosophically congruent with RCAC's objectives. It is rather difficult to judge if one pattern is superior to another in terms of implementing the objectives of RCAC.

This difficulty stems from the host of contingency variables which must be considered as one moves from college to college. For instance, is one pattern superior to another in an absolute sense because a given institution has "accomplished" more in terms of RCAC, or is this success more a function of such things as (1) congruency between the institutions philosophy toward rural community development, (2) the competence status, and expertise of the RCAC contact, (3) the time available for relevant individuals to devote to RCAC, etc. As far as the evaluation team was able to determine, the latter complex of factors appear to

be more significant than the "organizational house" when trying to isolate causative factors for RCAC's success or lack of it.

A carefully controlled experimental design and use of factor analysis techniques will be necessary before any degree of certainty can be established with respect to the effect of the institution's "organizational house" for RCAC and achievement of RCAC's objectives. Thus, until such time that either experimental research or long-term documented experiences indicates otherwise, each institution should be considered individually when trying to determine if RCAC is appropriately housed.

It should be noted that there does not appear in any individual institutional evaluation a single recommendation for reorganizing the respective on-campus home base for RCAC. Perhaps this is indicative that, as best as can be determined at this point in time, each of the respective institution's patterns for RCAC, have the potential for accomplishing RCAC's objectives.

A significant point to note in relation to the institutional level organization of RCAC is that only a few have formal, written institution plans and objectives for their participation in RCAC. Accordingly only very few were able to identify the organizational relationship of RCAC to other elements within the respective institutions. This factor is no doubt largely responsible for the data later presented which discusses the less than optimum level of

awareness and involvement of other institutional elements in RCAC activities.

Still another important point in this regard is that very few institutions had advisory committees or councils for the RCAC thrust at their institution. This too appears responsible for less than adequate communication and involvement on some campus with respect to RCAC.

Manpower.--As noted earlier each member of the consortium has on its campus a person who is charged with liaison between the school and RCAC Central. In addition to at least one individual at every school there was noted to be a cadre of other people who had, as part of their normal responsibilities, jobs which entailed objectives similar to those being strived for by RCAC (i.e., stimulate rural community development activities). Both administrative and faculty personnel comprised this cadre and included such individuals as, Director of Research, Development, Special Projects, Cooperative Extension, USDA Liaison Officers, Contracts and Grants; and faculty from Departments of Home Economics, Agriculture, Political Science, Sociology, Continuing Education, and Economics.

It is significant to note that the variance in potential manpower to engage in rural community development activities was great from institution to institution. For instance, Tuskegee reported a cadre of about 150 individuals (on and off campus) who could be called into action on such

projects, while several other institutions could identify only a few. It appears that the philosophical orientation of the institution (as well as its budget, obviously) is a critical factor. In "lean" institutions (lean, in terms of persons to engage in RCAC activities) it appears that emphasis is primarily, if not solely, devoted to teaching rather than extension activities. Thus, it appears in some instances, faculty and others are often not encouraged and are sometimes discouraged to engage in off-campus extension, non-credit type activities.

One of the fears that some institutions expressed was that they did not want to spread themselves too thin by trying to be "all things to all people." Likewise, concern was expressed that the money and support for rural community development activities was "soft" (not secure from year to year), and thus, they were reluctant to take faculty away from teaching responsibilities to engage in other kinds of activities. Also, concern was expressed that the smaller, less experienced, and less well funded black land grant institutions possibly could not compete with their predominately white institutional counterparts and might be adjudged as inferior or be unable to compete for dollars to conduct projects.

Nevertheless, it is the opinion of the evaluators that a powerful and potentially available "mix" is present on each campus visited and that RCAC must, in conjunction

with others, find ways of nurturing this "mix"--and its inherent hybrid vigor for making impacts on rural community development--to fruition. One of the ways in which this has apparently been accomplished quite effectively is by establishment of an on-campus RCAC committee or some similar group. Florida A & M University has taken this route, and their activities, accomplishment, and level of involvement of significant individuals has been quite impressive.

Before leaving the matter of institutional level manpower, several key observations concerning the RCAC contact are in order.

1. The RCAC contact appears to provide a critical difference as to whether an institution is extremely "successful" in relation to implementation of RCAC's objectives or whether it is not so successful. The status of the individual at the institution; his organizational links with his colleagues; his knowledge of the various needs of the surrounding rural communities; his competency with respect to community development; and his energy, enthusiasm, and "stick-to-it-ness" largely determine what RCAC is able to accomplish.

   The evaluation team saw a wide variation among the various RCAC campus representatives--from the very informed and successful to the uninformed and unsuccessful. Some were excited and serious about their responsibilities while others seemed to regard it as a burden. Fortunately, the former were in the majority. The evaluation team strongly urges that a re-evaluation of RCAC contacts be undertaken to isolate those not committed to the project and take appropriate actions to resolve the problem--whatever it may be.

2. The RCAC contact is not paid directly for the responsibilities he bears. Even the most committed must therefore primarily devote his attention to those matters for which he is paid. Since RCAC's success appears to be so vitally linked to the campus

representative, it is strongly urged that provisions be made to incorporate RCAC responsibilities as a part of a person's paid responsibilities. Serious consideration should be made to purchase a portion of the campus representatives time as a beginning in this direction.

3. The RCAC campus representative, except in one or two instances, has no formal job description of the duties and responsibilities associated with his role. RCAC Central should (a) develop some guidelines in this respect and distribute them; (b) encourage institutions to develop their own; or (c) conduct a workshop for RCAC campus representatives at which they, themselves, would develop job descriptions.

4. The critical nature of the RCAC contact and the newness of this type of responsibility suggest that many representatives could benefit from, and would, in fact, welcome, training sessions related to carrying out the various responsibilities entailed in their role as representatives and on-campus catalysts for RCAC activities.

Communication.--The data concerning communication between RCAC Central and the consortium members has already been discussed. However, at least three levels of communication occurring at the various institutions need to be considered. One type of communication concerns that which occurs between a given consortium institution and its fellow institutions.

Interviewees on all campuses were asked to respond to the following statement: Communication between the various local consortium schools about RCAC-type activities is sufficiently open and regular. The mean response given to this item was 3.1. This indicates that people were generally undecided as to whether communication between RCAC participants was sufficiently open and regular. No doubt,

approximately an equal number agreed as well as disagreed with this statement, thus having a net effect of being undecided. When the individual institution reports were examined, it was found that nearly one-third of the institutions felt that intra-consortium communications were not adequate. When these schools were examined in terms of RCAC accomplishments, it was found that they generally were ones which had not achieved RCAC's objectives as admirably as had other institutions. It appears then that those institutions which judged intra-consortium communication concerning RCAC matters to be adequate, on the whole were more successful at achieving RCAC objectives than were those who felt otherwise.

As noted earlier, many institutions in the consortium have initiated very creative and effective projects concerning RCAC. Likewise, some have developed models and ways and means of facilitating the accomplishment of RCAC objectives.

It seems logical, then, that in order to assist other colleges in achieving a greater level of success relative to RCAC, a cross sharing between and among institutions would be in order. Certainly there is a great deal that some institutions can learn from becoming aware of projects and activities in fellow institutions. For example, some of the things accomplished by Tuskegee and by Florida A & M could, no doubt, be of great assistance to other institutions as they attempt to do likewise. RCAC, then, should pay particular attention not only to facilitating communication between the

central office and the member colleges, but should also be a catalyst in stimulating communication between the various consortium colleges themselves.

If innovative ideas and concepts are to have a multiplier effect throughout the consortium, then conferences and workshops devoted to cross sharing of ways and means and accomplishments and a cross sharing of factors which facilitated and impeded the accomplishment of various objectives should be conducted on a regular basis.

Another level of communication which occurs at the institutional level involves a cross sharing between and among the people within the given institution. In other words, to what extent are the administrators, students, and faculty aware of the RCAC project and its objectives on a given campus? Interviewees on all campuses were asked to respond to the following statements: The Upper Level administration, faculty, and students at this university have a clear conception of the objectives of RCAC. Secondly, they were asked to respond to the statement: It is essential that these respective audiences have a clear conception of RCAC. The responses to these items indicated that most administrators on the campuses were aware of the RCAC project. The extent of agreement to this was valued at 4.3. With respect to the level of awareness on the part of the faculty a lower extent of agreement was noted, 3.2, while the extent of agreement with the statement concerning students was extremely low and was computed at 2.3.

Interviewees reported that they agreed that all three audiences should be aware of RCAC objectives and have a clear conception of them. This applied for administrators as well as for faculty and students. It is somewhat understandable that administrators would be more aware of the project than students; however, since RCAC objectives did involve upgrading faculty members capacities to become involved in community development work, it would appear that the lower level of awareness among faculty represents a critical problem.

The extremely low level of awareness on the part of students is also critical. Students on some campuses are now serving as valuable resources toward the implementation of rural community development activities. This is apparent from reading the FAMU as well as the Tuskegee report. However, on the whole, it would appear that most institutions in the consortium are making little effort to involve students in the RCAC project or any other type community development project. Thus, the above data suggests that intra-school communication concerning RCAC is less than adequate.

It is significant to note that campuses which had some type of RCAC committee organized (or an equivalent) had a higher level of awareness among all three audiences than campuses which did not. This, then, would seem to be another positive factor for organizing such RCAC-type campus committees.

Campus representatives frequently expressed a concern that there was not a sufficient level of awareness on campus about the RCAC project. They strongly felt that RCAC Central staff needed to visit the campus for the purpose of conducting orientation to RCAC-type workshops. Interviewees explained that such workshops should involve a wide range of people within the university as well as the various communities to be served by it.

RCAC visits to campuses should be made not with individuals, but with groups of people who have a potentially significant role to play in the implementation of RCAC's objectives and in the implementation of rural community development activities.

Another type of institutional level communication concerns that which occurs between the institutions and the various communities which they purport to serve. RCAC has as one of its objectives facilitating the dialogue between rural communities and Black Land Grant Colleges. Interviewees were split when asked if RCAC had had a significant impact on enhancing this dialogue.

Generally speaking, the institutions which had had success toward achieving RCAC-type objectives reported that their communications with the rural poor were much more frequent and regular. Likewise, they reported that there was greater involvement on the part of rural poor in planning and implementing RCAC related and non-RCAC related programs

than there was prior to the institution's involvement in the RCAC project. An outstanding example of considerable dialogue between a given institution and the community it serves is apparent at North Carolina A & T State University.

North Carolina A & T is engaged in a series of rural leadership development activities in coordination with the RCAC project. Extensive involvement of a wide variety of rural poor and their representatives has developed from this effort at North Carolina A & T. Their activities in this respect present a model for other consortium institutions to emulate in facilitating dialogue with the community. Here again, it is important to note that a workshop whereby consortium colleges might cross share what they are doing is a very important type activity for RCAC to consider.

The majority of the institutions visited reported that they had several means of communicating with the community. Most frequently mentioned were newsletters, radio and t.v. announcements and programs and a variety of face to face individual visits with rural community people. Generally speaking, a comparison of these various communication techniques in relation to the extent of the accomplishments of RCAC objectives reveals that institutions with a high degree of success in RCAC (i.e., Tuskegee) were making extensive use of both non-personal and personal types of communication. On the other hand, institutions not so successful with the RCAC project were relying almost solely on non-personal types of communications, if any.

Considerable research has been done on the use of personal versus non-personal communication devices. The research overwhelmingly shows that personal sources make the critical difference. Non-personal sources can contribute toward awareness and interest and, to some extent, evaluation of an activity, but the ultimate evaluation and the decision to become involved and adopt an innovation is mostly affected by a personal communication source.[1]

The research conducted by Rogers, et al. in relation to the adaptation of innovations is particularly significant for the RCAC project.[2] The RCAC project in the long run is an effort to have university people, as well as community people, adopt innovations.

If Rogers' research is valid (and there is every indication that it is), and if institutions expect to go beyond the awareness and interest stage and into the evaluation, trial, and adoption stage, then they must make extensive use of personalized communication with the rural community.

Institutions generally have had a great deal of experience in non-personal communication activities (i.e., newsletters, brochures, etc.). Perhaps a need which RCAC can fulfill is to

---

[1]Everett M. Rogers, Diffusion of Innovations (New York: The Free Press, 1962).

[2]Everett M. Rogers with F. Floyd Shoemaker, Communication of Innovations: A Cross-Cultural Approach (New York: Free Press, 1969).

train institutional representatives in personalized communication techniques for use with rural community poor.

Institutions also need to become adept in communicating to other aspects of the community in addition to the rural poor. Here the evaluators are referring to the formal power structure of the community. Certain institutions reported that since their involvement in RCAC, their level of communication between various agencies, institutions, and organizations in the surrounding community and at the state level had increased. Once again, it was noted that "successful" institutions (in relation to RCAC) reported more of an increase in this respect than institutions which were not so "successful" (in relation to RCAC).

Dialogue between the institutions and state and local agencies is critical if the institutions are to be effective in implementing rural community development activities. Obviously a single institution cannot do all that needs to be done to bring about change in these communities. However, an institution can serve as a catalyst in getting other agencies and institutions to blend their services together in such a way that the needs of the people in the various communities are met in a more composite fashion.

Here again, RCAC can play a vital role in conducting workshops and training sessions on facilitating inter-agency coordination. What are the relevant social service agencies in a given community? How can these agencies, institutions, and organizations be involved? What types of services are needed by

the people of the community? How does one go about blending services in such a way to match up with the needs of people? These are a few of the questions which institutions must be able to answer if they are to effectively serve the rural poor. RCAC can and should assist institutions in answering these questions.

Communication is, as stated earlier, at the heart of RCAC's objectives. The problems of the rural poor are in every sense of the word, multi-dimensional. It cannot conceivably be expected for a given institution to meet the needs of the rural poor. The multi-dimensionality of the problems of the rural poor demand not a uni-dimensional solution but a multi-dimensional solution. Only through institutional cooperation and coordination can this multi-disciplinary response become a reality. Cooperation and communication itself are only achieved via communication linkages.

In this regard a possibility for RCAC to explore in developing workshops aimed at inter-agency coordination, concerns a special U. S. Office of Education project entitled Project Communi-Link. This project operating out of the Colorado State University seeks to assist rural communities in developing inter-agency linkages and communication linkages aimed at solving the problems of disadvantaged adults. The heart of the project is communication and inter-agency coordination and

cooperation toward the resolution of the problems of rural poor and undereducated. As a part of their training programs to achieve these objectives, Project Communi-Link has made extensive use of a simulation gaming device called Microville. Microville is designed to teach program development via interagency cooperation, coordination, and communication. Several members of the evaluation team are acquainted with Microville and urge its consideration as a training device in the RCAC project.

RCAC Services

As noted earlier, the objectives of RCAC were to have been accomplished via the following means: (1) periodic conferences, consultative services and on-site field visits by training and technical assisted personnel; (2) training programs and technical assistance to consortium members on techniques and developing and submitting funding proposals; (3) developing and organizing programs which provide supportive services for the rural poor; and (4) collecting, analyzing, and disseminating pertinent information from consortium members and the remaining NASULGC institutions to consortium members. RCAC has concentrated most of its efforts on items one and two above.

Exemplary of the types of training and technical assistance activities provided by RCAC were those described in the report dated June, 1972 from the RCAC office. Excerpts are provided below.

Education-Training Sessions*

Twenty-one consultants were utilized as a part of two training sessions held during the year. Two organizations were engaged to provide training for Consortium school representatives, namely, (1) The Human Resources Development Center staff, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, and (2) The Technical Analysis Division of the Institute of Applied Technology, National Bureau of Standards. The Tuskegee Institute Workshop was a two-day training session held at the Human Resources Development Center, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama. The staff and site were selected because of their close affinity to Consortium institutions, programmatically and geographically. Twenty-seven participants representing ten member institutions participated. Significant topics discussed included the following: (1) Rural Development--A Challenge to the 1890 Colleges; (2) Involving Students in Rural Development Planning and Programming; (3) Economic Development in the Rural South; (4) The Rural South: Its Problems, Promises, and Strategies for Action; and (5) Progress, Problems and Potentials of RCAC

Immediately following the Tuskegee Workshop representatives of four RCAC institutions traveled to Washington, D. C. to participate in an OEO Briefing Conference for a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Evaluation of Southern Rural Housing. Three institutions were included in proposals submitted by large national research groups. Unfortunately, none was included in the firm gaining the bid. Formal evaluations completed by participants rated the overall Tuskegee Workshop excellent.

An Operation Research Workshop was conducted for the Consortium by the Technical Analysis Division of the National Bureau of Standards on June 15-16, 1972. North Carolina A & T State University served as the host institution. Operations Research represents a new approach to problem-solving through the application of mathematics and computers. Presentations relevant to RCAC institutions included: (1) Operations Research in Black Colleges; (2) The Technical Analysis Division, Its Mission in Applied Technology; (3) Improving Distribution of Federal Aid to Disadvantaged Children; (4) Computer

---

*Additional activities have ensued since the publication of this report.

Conferencing Techniques; (5) Operations Research Orientation; and (6) Tuskegee Transportation Project. The Tuskegee project represents efforts to establish a rural transportation system in Macon County, Alabama, a point of interest to all participants. Nineteen participants including twelve representatives of seven Consortium institutions expressed satisfaction with the thrust of the presentations. In most instances the operations approach opened a new vista.

Technical Assistance*

A total of twenty-five contacts involving twenty-two persons were provided by consultants during the first program year.

The RCAC Tuskegee Workshop served as the major effort through which fifteen consultants served in the dual role of training and technical assistance consultants. In addition to those provided in the previously mentioned workshops, the three institutions requesting consultants were provided the same. Lincoln University of Missouri utilized a consultant as an aid to determining program directions in its Hayti Heights Community related outreach project. Fort Valley State College (Ga.) made use of two consultants in a two-day proposal writing seminar designed to improve the sensitivities and proposal writing skills of faculty, staff, and interested community leaders.

Some of the training sessions described above were conducted at the institutional level, which means that they were held just for the representatives of a given institution. Other training sessions were held at the consortium-wide level, which means that representatives from each of the consortium institutions were invited to participate. Participants in these respective training sessions evaluated the experiences quite positively. They were appreciative

---

*Additional activities have ensued since the publication of this report.

of the opportunities which RCAC had afforded them for their own professional growth and for enhancing their institutions' thrust in rural community development endeavors.

Although not all participants could cite specific projects initiated due to their participation in these training sessions, all felt that spin-offs from the knowledge and skills gained were imminent. Several participants were able to cite specific examples of outcomes, i.e., acquisition of surplus property, stimulation of proposal development, success in getting proposals funded, greater awareness of possible funding sources, etc.

When asked to rate the contribution of the various training sessions attended toward achieving their respective institution's RCAC related objectives, 72% said very much, 14% said much, 10% said some, and 4% said little or none.

It would appear that RCAC has done a commendable job in providing relevant training experiences to consortium members. The fact that the experiences were evaluated so highly is particularly significant in light of the diversity of participants and the diversity of institutions represented in the training programs. This diversity would seem to make it very difficult to find training experiences which were relevant to all, yet RCAC seems to have focused in on several areas of concern which cut across institutional boundaries.

There was some indication, however, that training sessions at the institutional level were evaluated somewhat

higher than were consortium-wide training sessions. No doubt, this is due to the fact that the institutional level training sessions involved people from a given institution who could share ideas together and form an indigenous task force to act upon some of the ideas generated in the workshop and apply newly gained skills. Likewise, the training programs may have been particularly more catered to the needs of the participants than were the consortium-wide workshops.

At every institution visited during the evaluation, respondents were highly favorable of having an institutional level workshop on their campus. They were still in favor of consortium-wide training programs, but felt the need to have something localized for their particular needs and interest also. It was stressed that this should be a priority item for RCAC during its next year of operation.

Respondents supported the methodology employed by RCAC in attaining its objectives. They were asked to respond to the following statement: <u>The RCAC thrust toward education training programs, technical assistance, and certain types of financial aid has been an effective procedure for accomplishing the objectives of the effort</u>. The response to this item was calculated at 3.71, thus indicating that respondents tended to agree that this was an effective approach for RCAC to take. However, it was quite obvious that schools which had had the benefit of institutional level training programs were overwhelmingly more positive

toward the approach RCAC was following than were schools who had not had institutional level training programs. Thus, Southern University, North Carolina A & T, Tuskegee, and Fort Valley, for instance, were very positive toward the approach RCAC was taking while some of the other institutions tended to be undecided or to disagree with RCAC's approach. The inference here is that where RCAC has functioned actively on a given campus in the form of workshops and training programs, its efforts have been highly regarded and supported. Where RCAC has failed to have institutional level training programs, its approach has either been criticized or left in doubt.

One of RCAC's proximate aims concerns staff development among the various consortium institutions, thus respondents were asked to react to the following statement: RCAC is a major factor in member institutions' staff development programs. The average response to this item was calculated at 3.4, an indication that respondents were generally undecided about the role of RCAC in this respect. Even the colleges which had had institutional level training programs were, on the whole, undecided. Some of the colleges where no training programs had been held at the institutional level clearly indicated an attitude that RCAC was not a major factor in their staff development program.

From the foregoing analysis of these two items, it appears that while RCAC's training programs have been effective

and of assistance, they are not, as yet, of the magnitude to justify their consideration as being major elements of the institutions' staff development program. It seems conceivable that RCAC could develop into a major staff development force among the consortium institutions, but that considerably more liaison activities between the institutions and RCAC central will have to be developed as will additional resources for conducting staff development programs. Another vital factor to consider is the nature of the training programs themselves.

If RCAC is to become a major factor in a given institution's staff development program, then it will have to be extremely sensitive to that institutions' needs and will have to structure training programs accordingly. Apparently, RCAC, on the whole, is already quite sensitive to the consortium members needs and wants. This conclusion is based on interviewees response to the following statement: The Central RCAC staff is aware of and sensitive to consortium member institutions needs and wants. Of twelve responding institutions, eight agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, two disagreed, and two were undecided. Consortium-wide the level of agreement indice was 3.9.

As one might imagine, the institutions critical of RCAC's sensitivity to their needs were ones which had had the least contact and involvement in RCAC activities. Thus, there is room for RCAC to expand its sensitivities to member institution's needs--particularly with respect to those less active

in RCAC to date. RCAC did engage in an institutional needs survey during the spring of 1971 and a follow-up study in the fall of the same year. However, it has not been established what, if any, action-oriented steps evolved from these studies. Results of that needs assessment are presented below.

TOP PRIORITY OF PROGRAM INTERESTS THROUGH RCAC
(As identified by Survey, Spring, 1971
and
reaffirmed Fall, 1971

Child Development (7)

Alabama A&M, Fort Valley State, Kentucky State, Lincoln University, North Carolina A & T, Tennessee State, and Virginia State

Health and Nutrition (5)

Alcorn A&M, Kentucky State, North Carolina A&T, South Carolina State, and Tennessee State

Economic and Manpower Development (5)

Florida A&M, Lincoln University, North Carolina A&T, South Carolina State, and Southern University

Community Leadership and Development (5)

Alcorn A&M, Fort Valley State, Lincoln University, North Carolina A&T, and Southern University

Recreation (8)

Florida A&M, Fort Valley State, North Carolina A&T, Prairie View A&M, South Carolina State, Southern University, Tennessee State, and Virginia State

Continuing Education Programs for Rural People (6)

Alabama A&M, Arkansas AM&N, Fort Valley State, South Carolina State, Virginia State, and Prairie View A&M.

In addition to RCAC paying more attention to needs assessment, the participating institutions themselves should examine their needs and request services from RCAC. As earlier reported, respondents felt that RCAC should be more aggressive in stimulating members to take advantage of its resources. On the other hand, respondents tended to be undecided when asked if their institution had taken full advantage of the opportunity for development which RCAC had afforded them.

In essence, in many instances, the schools themselves had not used RCAC to the level to which they felt it could be used. This no doubt is related to a syndrome of factors, not the least of which is (1) the lack of RCAC's Central manpower to stimulate and carry out requests and (2) the general lack of awareness of some institutional faculty members of RCAC's objectives, and, in some cases, its existence. Even the institutions which have most actively participated in the project felt that they had not utilized RCAC to their advantage, and that they too should become more actively involved in RCAC.

Further probing for the reasons for institutions not fully utilizing the service of RCAC reveals the following factors: (1) most institutions are understaffed and undermanned and thus there is not sufficient time to become involved in proposal and/or rural community development activities, hence RCAC's services were not utilized to their fullest advantage; (2) as earlier noted, some institutions were overly concerned about the academic

program and feared that becoming involved in rural community development activities would in effect undermine their academic program; (3) lack of communication between RCAC central and some colleges, lack of communication between and among consortium schools, and lack of communication within consortium schools all had negative impacts as far as an institution's utilization of services of RCAC were concerned; (4) some of the institutions explained that their traditional emphasis had been on teacher training rather than on extension research and development, hence progress towards becoming active in the latter types of activities was understandably slow.

Institutional Impact of RCAC

The impact of RCAC on the various consortium institutions has followed two lines: (1) it has affected the institutions internally, and (2) it has affected the institution in relation to the community. Obviously these two outcomes are interrelated. Internally, RCAC seems to have aroused within the institutions a greater awareness of and concern for the institutions' capacities to assist rural communities. Likewise, it has stimulated increased activities on the part of administrators, faculties, and students to engage in activities related to these communities.

Interviewees were asked to respond to the following statement: The RCAC project is recognized by the institutions' administration as a valuable catalyst. An agreement factor of 3.97 was calculated for this item. RCAC is

apparently helping some institutions to meet a variety of needs and stimulate them to expand their role perceptions, and hence definitions and responsibilities. This is probably the reason why an agreement factor of only 2.3 was calculated when interviewees were asked to respond to the statement: The RCAC effort is simply a duplication of what is already normally being done by the university itself. In other words, it appears that RCAC is serving unique functions to the institutions--functions, apparently, heretofore, not carried out or not as salient.

When the responses of the institutions were considered individually with respect to the previously mentioned item, it was found that institutions less active in RCAC tended to have a higher rate of agreement with this item than did institutions who were moderately or very active. Nevertheless, even those institutions which had had very least involvement in RCAC still disagreed that RCAC was a duplication of what the university was already normally doing.

It seems fair to conclude that RCAC is not a duplication of current activities on campus, that it has something unique to offer, that the consortium recognize that uniqueness and desire RCAC continuation. This statement is further supported by additional data collected from interviewees when they were asked to respond to the statement: There is an urgent and continuing need for RCAC-type projects within the various consortium schools. The level of agreement calculated for this

item was 4.3. With the exception of one institution, all institutions responded with an agreement index of 4.0 or greater, thus even the least active schools of the RCAC project felt that RCAC was urgently needed and that such a need was a continuing one--one which must not exist for merely a year and then cease. This is particularly significant when one considers the backgrounds of those interviewed and their respective positions within the various institutions. These interviewees were very experienced and insightful professionals occupying key decision-making positions within the Black Land Grant Institutions of this country. (Presidents, Vice Presidents, Deans, Department Heads, and key faculty members.)

Further reflective of the impact of RCAC on the consortium institutions were interviewees' responses to the statement: RCAC efforts will result in a residual force of trained proposal writers and creative program designers if given sufficient time and money.

Once again, interviewees indicated agreement with this item (factor = 4.0). Here, however, it was noted that the more actively involved RCAC institution tended to to respond to this item with a higher level of agreement than did those less actively involved. Thus institutions like Florida A & M, Tuskegee, Ft. Valley and others expressed a relatively high level of agreement with this item, while lesser involved institutions as Kentucky State, Virginia State and several others tended to fall into the undecided category with respect to this item.

Every institution in the consortium with the exception of two felt that given sufficient time, the dollars invested in RCAC would be returned many fold by the institutions' improved capacity to attract public and private funds via proposal development. Of the two which differed from the rest of the population, one institution's reaction was undecided with respect to this while the other disagreed with respect to this item. The latter institution was one in which very little involvement in RCAC was noted. Here again, the pattern emerges that the more active institutions are in RCAC, the more highly positive their attitudes are toward RCAC.One hastens to add that even the lesser involved institutions still regarded RCAC as a potentially positive and influential factor in enhancing their capabilities for engaging in rural community development activities.

About half of the consortium members reported that the quality of proposals generated at their institutions since RCAC's inception had improved. The other half were basically undecided about this matter. Included in the former group, however, were such pretigious institutions as Tuskegee. This should rank as quite an accomplishment in light of the past history of Tuskegee's outstanding success in securing funds via proposal development. Many of the institutions reported that the number of proposals generated since RCAC's inception at their institution had increased also. Reasons given for this outcome which were

related to RCAC's activities at the institution were as follows: (1) the university had internally developed and improved capacities for submitting and writing proposals, (2) faculty, students, and staff had become increasingly aware of project opportunities, (3) the university administration had increased its encouragement for persons to develop proposals and, (4) increased technical assistance had been provided in the development of proposals. Most of the institutions reported that the number of proposals funded had increased since RCAC's initiation at their institution. The reasons given for this, which could be linked to activities of RCAC, were the same as those given for the increase of numbers of proposals submitted.

In essence, RCAC seems to have increased the institutions number of proposals, quality of proposals, and proposals funded--either directly or indirectly. It should be noted here that causality cannot be established firmly between RCAC's activities and the outcomes just alluded to. They are definitely of a correlational nature, and it would appear that logically and empirically, the existence of RCAC has made a difference, perhaps a significant one.

The manner in which RCAC had affected institution's capability for the administration of projects was also alluded to by some of the respondents. Several institutions reported that since RCAC's existence, the university had improved liaison between public and private agencies with respect to community development activities. Also it was

reported by several institutions that their Office of Development had been improved and that more and more faculty members were being released for the purpose of developing projects. Perhaps one of the more significant factors which was mentioned was that RCAC had helped to increase the visibility of Black Colleges to the nation as a whole and to funding agencies in particular.

Community Impact of RCAC

Before discussing the impact of RCAC on the community it is of extreme importance that it be realized that such impact can only be made manifest via the respective Black Land Grant Institutions which comprise the consortium. In a sense, RCAC is a means-oriented project, that is, its intent is to establish a mechanism whereby Black Land Grant Institutions might relate more effectively to rural poor. Thus, the impact of RCAC on the community is an indirect one.

The end for RCAC is the institution while the end for the institution is the community. The extent to which RCAC has assisted institutions to develop a capacity to effectively relate to rural communities is reflected by interviewees responses to the statement: RCAC has played an important role in helping this institution in securing more funds for improving the quality of life in rural communities. Only about 1/5 of the institutions did not feel that RCAC had assisted their school in this manner. One school was undecided about this factor and the remainder agreed that RCAC had played

such a role with respect to their institution. Thus it appears that RCAC is, in fact, helping institutions to establish a means toward achieving an end aimed at rural community development. The extent of agreement consortium wide was 3.7.

Interviewees were also asked to respond to the following item: There are evidences to suggest that the RCAC effort with member institutions is having both a direct and indirect impact on improving the quality of life in the community. Consortium wide, respondents agreed with this item (factor = 4.2). Except for three institutions, all were in agreement with respect to this statement. Of these three dissenting, two were undecided about the item and only one disagreed with it. It is again significant to note here that these three dissenters were among the less active and less successful instances of consortium members with respect to participation in RCAC.

The extent of impact on the community can to some extent also be inferred from the degree to which RCAC has played a role in helping institutions secure funds for community development efforts.

RCAC has played a role in either directly or indirectly, in the development and/or funding of a number of proposals aimed at community development. These include the following:

Grants awarded through active involvement of RCAC:

A. $30,000 Xerox grant awarded to Prairie View A & M College (Texas) for a "Rural Health Services Delivery" project.

B. $10,000 U. S. Office of Education grant to Southern University (Baton Rouge) for community leadership and problem identification.

C. $10,000 U. S. Office of Education grant to Fort Valley State College (Georgia) for community leadership identification and dialogue.

D. $10,000 U. S. Office of Education grant to North Carolina A & T State University for Community leadership development.

E. $260,930 U. S. Department of Labor grant to Tennessee State University for continuation of a Rural Manpower Delivery Program (The Lazy Susan).

F. $701,885 U. S. Department of Labor grant to Prairie View A & M College (Texas) for a Rural Manpower Training Program for 230 enrollees.

G. $15,000 U. S. Office of Education grant to Southern University (La.) for a Rural Leadership and Community Workers Conference involving 128 leaders from the 64 parishes in the state of Louisiana.

H. $15,000 Rural Randolph County (N. C.) local government grant to the Liberty Community growing out of the U.S.O.E. Leadership Development project at North Carolina A & T State University.

I. $50,000 land and building value of a new community center being erected in the Farmer community of tne Rural Leadership Development project at North Carolina A & T State University. Land is being donated by the United Methodist Church.

J. $65,000 loans from the Small Business Administration to two rural businessmen in the Middle Georgia area growing out of faculty and community involvement in the U.S.O.E.-funded short-term institute for community leadership at the Fort Valley State College (Ga.).

K. $75,000 Office of Minority Business Enterprises grant for a Multi-County Small Business Development Center

in Houston and Peach counties (Ga.) growing out of the U.S.O.E.-funded short-term institute for community leadership at the Fort Valley State College.

L. $50,000, Office of Economic Opportunity grant for utilization by the 16 Consortium institutions for purchase of surplus equipment, to RCAC. This grant will permit the acquisition of equipment with a total value ranging between $1 million and $1.75 million.

Grants pending (Proposals submitted through initiative or indirect involvement of RCAC):

A. $350,000 - Center for Economic Development to Southern University, Economic Development Administration, Department of Commerce.

B. $260,000 - High School Equivalency Program (HEP), Office of Economic Opportunity.

Requests submitted by:

-South Carolina State College
-Southern University
-Florida A & M University
-Virginia State College

C. $272,000 - Operation Hitchhike" (Rural Manpower), Department of Labor, to Tennessee State University.

D. $900,000 (at $300,000 each) - Home-based Migrant Training Program, Department of Labor

-North Carolina A & T State University
-Tuskegee Institute
-Virginia State College

E. $342,650 - Water Pollution Control, a manpower development and training program of the Environmental Protection Agency, to Tennessee State University.

F. $811,714 - Regional Institute for Extension Studies (RIFES), a Training and Retraining program for extension workers designed to reach the alienated and disadvantaged people, Departments of Labor and Agriculture, to Southern University (La.).

G. $124,598 - Regional Institute for Extension Studies (RIFES), similar to the above, Departments of Labor and Agriculture, to Prairie View A & M College (Texas).

H. $200,00 - Business Development Center to serve businessmen and would-be businessmen in rural Southeast Alabama, Office of Minority Business Enterprises, to Tuskegee Institute (Ala.).

As far as the evaluation team was able to determine, the above listing of proposal and grants is an accurate one. The difficulty encountered as these were examined was determining the extent to which RCAC had been associated with the proposals' development and/or the grants being awarded. Here again the terms causality and correlation become relevant. Obviously, RCAC alone did not cause all of these proposals and grants to come into being. For some, it is known that RCAC definitely plays a crucial role (i.e., $30,000 xerox grant to Prairie View). For others, RCAC's influence may have been operating in more subtle ways. It is difficult to assess exactly what "below the surface" impacts RCAC has had on these, as well as other yet to be identified proposals and grants. Nonetheless, it cannot be denied that since RCAC's existence, Black Land Grants Institutions have enjoyed more success in having proposals developed and funded.

RCAC's first year in-house evaluation alludes to various projects in which it has played some role. The following summary statement appears therein.

> At the time of this report twelve grants, totaling $1.3 million had been awarded to RCAC institutions as a result of the involvement of the Consortium. These grants include rural service projects such as community leadership identification and development, economic and manpower development, health and nutrition, recreation,

> and acquisition of equipment necessary to deal effectively with rural development problems. While one should never second-guess the federal bureaucracy, with all its attendant problems, eight additional grants totaling $3.3 million were under consideration by agencies. The prospects appeared excellent that, of these, four grants totaling $1.1 million would be funded shortly.

The in-house evaluation maintained that the foregoing summary and the attendent benefits member institutions and their respective rural community target areas derive from these funds, more than justified the existence of RCAC. The knowledge of RCAC gained by the present external evaluation team leads them to this same conclusion. It is rare when such a project with complex objectives, like RCAC's, can muster sufficient evidence to justify its existence after only one year of operation. However, the conclusion of the evaluation team which seems even more important than the above one is that: there is every indication that RCAC's full potential is yet to be realized and that the future holds even more significant and impressive outcomes in store.

D. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Based upon the foregoing data and analysis, the following conclusions were drawn.

I. With respect to Organization and Staffing:

A. Project Central Level

1. RCAC's location within the OAPNC and within the NASULGC is an optimum arrangement which affords it many benefits including (a) communication linkages with key representatives from institutions of higher education and potential funding sources, and (b) a comprehensive, knowledgeable, and facilitative advisory council.

2. Fiscally speaking, RCAC is a soundly managed, responsible project which has instituted procedures to insure the continuance of the same.

3. RCAC Central is undermanned at present and has always been so. This has led to many attendant problems, most of them relating to an overworked staff and inadequate liaison with some consortium member.

4. The Central staff has not been sufficiently aggressive in stimulating member institution to utilize its resources for training and technical assistance. This is a function of insufficient manpower.

5. RCAC's Central public information effort has been of high quality but of insufficient scope and magnitude. The efforts have been somewhat sporadic rather than part of an overall, coordinated plan. This, too, is a function of insufficient manpower.

6. RCAC has established effective linkages with a number of governmental and private agencies, institutions, and organizations which have a high potential for funding rural community development projects.

   There is every indication that RCAC will continue to form still more linkages of this nature and will continue to further solidify those established to date.

B. Institutional Level

1. At the institutional level RCAC is organizationally "housed" in a variety of ways. As yet it cannot

be determined if one single pattern is superior to another as far as being facilitative of the project's objectives. For the moment, all patterns seem to hold the potential for getting the job done.

2. Very few consortium member institutions have developed institutional plans for their participation in RCAC. This has led to confusion and lack of understanding with respect to how RCAC relates to other university elements. Likewise, the absence of such plans, has inhibited the involvement of some university elements central to rural community development projects.

3. For the most part, member institutions are without advisory committees for RCAC projects. This is a function of the absence of a formal institutional plan. Likewise the absence of advisory councils has tended to make it difficult to develop awareness and secure involvement on the part of key university elements and community representatives.

4. On each campus there is a cadre of potentially available resource people whose normal responsibilities entail responsibilities related to

the objective of RCAC. This mix, if mobilized, had the potential hybrid vigor needed to alleviate and/or resolve many problems faced by the rural poor. Some institutions have mobilized this cadre; some have not. Action in this respect seems to be linked to a number of factors, such as, historical posture of the institution toward community development and extension, expectations for faculty, role perception of faculty, competence and interest on the part of the RCAC campus representative, presence of an active RCAC campus committee or related body.

5. On-campus RCAC representatives differ widely in their knowledge and enthusiasm for RCAC. The representative serves as liaison personnel in addition to being a full time administrator and/or faculty member. Often times, this results necessarily in RCAC being a low priority concern, hence many institutions are not as actively involved as they could be, should be, or want to be.

   Many of these on-campus representatives desire more orientation to RCAC and would welcome training from RCAC with respect to carrying out their responsibilities.

6. Generally speaking, consortium members are not mutually aware of the various RCAC activities in which each is engaged. Very little, if any, planned cross sharing of ideas, needs, etc. is evident. With few exceptions, each institution seems to be going its own separate way. Few collaborative efforts to resolve a common problem can be discerned. Furthermore, no formal mechanism for specifically cross-sharing appears to be planned. This is quite unfortunate on at least three counts: (a) many new and creative ideas worthy of emulating never get disseminated, (b) costly duplication and competition occur unknowlingly; and (c) the full potential of the consortium to make massive assaults on common problems is never fully realized.

7. Generally, the mutual awareness of RCAC related activities within each of the institutions is at a low level. In schools, the rural community development efforts are fragmented and isolated (organizationally and operationally) from one another. The ultimate negative outcomes of this condition parallel those just noted in item six above.

8. As one moves down the institutional hierarchy (president, vice president, deans, etc.), the level of awareness of RCAC and its objectives generally decreases as does the direct involvement of these respective parties. Thus, administrators are the most aware and involved and students are the least.

9. On the whole, consortium institutions have not achieved a very high level of awareness or involvement of rural community members with respect to RCAC activities carried out to date.

10. Tuskegee provides a model for a rural community development center worthy of all institutions' study and consideration for adoption. The same is true in relation to North Carolina A & T's rural community leadership development efforts and Florida A & M's involvement of students in rural community development activities.

11. Local consortium institutions apparently rely more extensively on non-personal than personal means of communicating with the rural poor. This is in conflict with both documented experience and empirical research.

12. Most local consortium institutions have had considerable success in linking their community development activities to the services and efforts of other relevant agencies. However, both the quantity and quality of these linkages could and should be enhanced.

II. With respect to RCAC Services:

1. Consortium members have not taken full advantage of the resources of RCAC. It is a function of several factors including: (a) insufficient awareness among consortium faculty and staff with the potential RCAC holds for assistance; (b) understaffed institutions which felt they cannot spare the manpower to become involved in additional activities; (c) on-campus representatives have failed to "push" RCAC; (d) RCAC Central has not been sufficiently aggressive in stimulating consortium schools to use its services.

2. When institutions have utilized RCAC's assistance and/or participate in RCAC-sponsored workshops they have regarded such experiences as being generally useful and of a high quality.

3. Generally, institutional level training sessions appear to be more relevant and evaluated more highly than consortium-wide sessions.

4. Although some participants are not able to cite specific outcomes stemming from their experience in RCAC training session, there appears to be a number of subtle actual and potential spin-offs which can directly linked to their experiences.

5. There is a high demand for training sessions tailored specifically for a given consortium institution.

6. There is strong support for the present RCAC methodological reliance on training, technical assistance, and limited types of financial assistance. This support is more apparent among actively involved consortium members than less active ones.

7. RCAC's training and technical assistance efforts are not yet of sufficient magnitude to warrant their being considered as a major factor in consortium members' staff development programs.

However, it was felt that RCAC had the potential to so develop. This outcome appears to be linked to the factors cited in item one, above.

8. Generally, RCAC is considered to be aware of and sensitive to consortium members needs and wants. Less actively involved colleges tend, however, to be undecided or to disagree with this statement. Although RCAC has made several formal assessments of institutional needs, it was not clear how these data had led to action steps toward their resolution.

III. With respect to the Institutional Impact and Community Impact of RCAC:

1. RCAC has had positive effects on the various consortium institutions both with respect to their internal operations and with respect to their relationships with surrounding rural communities.

2. RCAC is fulfilling a need for the member institutions which has heretofore either been unfelt or neglected. RCAC does have something unique to offer these institutions and has a

unique role to play. Also, there are several activities on each of the campuses which have a relationship with and relevance to RCAC, these do not appear to be duplicative though they are not necessarily mutually exclusive in every character.

3. The key administrators within the consortium schools recognize RCAC as a valuable catalyst and feel there is an urgent and continuing need for the project.

4. There is widespread agreement that RCAC's efforts will result in a residual force of trained proposal writers and creative program designers. Accordingly, equally strong convictions are held that RCAC's expense as a project will return manyfold by the additional dollars institutions will attract due to increased awareness and skills relating to proposal development.

Furthermore, it already appears that the number and quality of proposals developed and the number funded have increased at member institutions since RCAC's inception.

Institutions have increased their liaison and ties with both public and private potential funding sources and community development resources. Evidence exists which suggests that RCAC was either directly or indirectly instrumental in regard to many of these outcomes.

5. Finally, the community and institutional impacts of RCAC are difficult to isolate for purposes of establishing causality. Doubtless, there have been many never reported spin offs from RCAC activities which had had varying degrees of impact on institutions and communities, and on individuals therein.

The impacts of some of these activities are quite measurable, apparent, and attributable to RCAC; however, the greater number are more subtle and illusive to discern. Yet, it is precisely these small, sub-surface impacts that in the final analysis make the difference between action and lack of action and success and failure.

Recommendations

1. RCAC Central should expand its staff by the addition of at least two and preferably four people. The total staff should be assigned to specific consortium schools and should be responsible for keeping these institutions aware of and actively involved in RCAC's plans and activities. On a trial basis, each staff member should be assigned to a given number of member institutions, with the Director taking less responsibility for individual colleges and acting more at the consortium-wide level.

2. RCAC Central should conduct an "Orientation to RCAC" workshop on the campus of each of the 16 consortium colleges. The rationale for, objectives of, and resources available from RCAC should be fully explained.

   Participants in this workshop should include persons who were referred to in this report as an on-campus cadre of potential resource. Likewise, representatives from the various rural communities in the area should be involved. This would provide initial linkages between RCAC, the consortium member institution and rural community residents.

The workshop should be concluded with some specific action plans being established with respect to how the institutions and the rural community will use RCAC's services. Where possible, representatives from "successful" RCAC institutions should be in attendance.

3. An existing or newly appointed staff member should be specifically assigned responsibilities for public relations and public information activities. This person should not only deal with the general public's understanding of RCAC, but should develop mechanisms for facilitating intra-consortium members cross sharing of ideas, projects, and problems.

   A monthly RCAC newsletter is suggested to provide information on current activities among the consortium institutions, proposed activities, potential sources of new funds, announcements of important community development meetings, practical suggestions on what to do--or how to do it, etc. (Such a newsletter should be widely disseminated to all deans, departmental chairmen, project directors, and extension workers and selected faculty.)

4. A detailed, controlled, experimentally designed study should be made to determine which type of local institution organizational "house" for RCAC is most conducive to accomplishing the project's objective. Likewise, this research should also identify other factors which impede or enhance achievement of these objectives.

5. RCAC should stimulate every institution to develop an institutional plan for its actions in relation to the objectives of the consortium. Perhaps this plan could grow out of the orientation workshop mentioned in recommendation number two above. Or, perhaps a follow-up planning workshop could be scheduled--complete with appropriate technical consultants, RCAC staff, institutional staff, and community representatives.

6. Each consortium institution should be stimulated to have an on-campus RCAC committee or advisory group of some sort. This group should serve planning, coordination, implementation, and evaluation functions. RCAC should assume responsibility for providing or securing training for these committees.

7. RCAC should investigate some innovative means for training persons for program developmemt, inter-agency cooperation and coordination, and community development. It is recommended that Microville, for example, be studied for possible use in this respect.

8. With respect to the on-campus RCAC representative. RCAC Central should arrange to purchase a portion of the representative's time. This would provide RCAC with some say in who that person might be and it would also increase the likelihood of attention being specifically and more regularly devoted to RCAC concerns.

9. RCAC should assume responsibility for the training of on-campus RCAC representatives. Periodic staff development sessions involving these persons would not only contribute to their expertise, awareness, and involvement, but would also facilitate problem and need identification and cross-sharing.

10. RCAC should take the initiative to stimulate development of guidelines for on-campus representatives job descriptions. The involvement of the campus representatives in the actual development of these guidelines is strongly recommended.

11. RCAC should host a cross-sharing/update worksnip, at least two a year, to develop mutual awareness among the various institutions and to plan coordinative collaborative projects. At such workshops innovative projects and concepts might be discussed in detail and others encouraged to adopt them.

12. There is a critical need to develop some type of plan or incentive for encouraging faculty members to become involved in RCAC and RCAC related activities both on and off-campus. Such a plan might be either institutionally based or RCAC based or both. Some way must be found to stimulate greater involvement of faculty.

It is obvious that the reward system in most state universities favors the traditional academic role in the areas of teaching and research. Overburdened faculty and staff have all they can do in servicing their regular undergraduate and graduate programs, those who do build linkages with community problems and needs tend to be the exceptions rather than the rule.

State funding formulae and legislation (such as the recently enacted 12-hour law in Florida) recognize

credit hours produced in college classrooms and penalize the institution's involvement in off-campus, non-credit community problem solving activities.

As a consequence nearly all efforts to engage in community development work have been done outside of load by the faculty, or by temporary staff on "soft" funds, or at the expense of foregoing the rewards which come to those who remain on-campus in an isolated publish or perish environment.

13. RCAC should re-engage in a needs assessment among member institutions.

14. RCAC should encourage and assist member institutions to develop a resource directory of key personnel agencies, etc., both on and off-campus which has a contribution to make with respect to planning, implementing, and/or evaluating RCAC-type activities.

15. Using the aforementioned institutional RCAC plans and other relevant inputs, RCAC Central itself should develop a master plan for its long range goals and activities. This plan should subsequently be disseminated to significant others, critiqued, and revised.

Hypothetically, such a plan might call for:

a. Improving intrauniversity (inter-school) cooperation and coordination in community development

b. The preparation of extension agents and continuing educators

c. The evaluation of a significant action program

d. The use of x number of specified consultants for in-house faculty development seminars; or for need identification, idea creating sessions prior to proposal development, etc.

16. RCAC should change from a "call upon us if you need help" posture to a more aggressive or active one which seeks to identify problems and needs within member institutions.

17. For the immediate future, RCAC should de-emphasize its role in helping member institutions develop proposals for outside funds, and develop as its primary mission the training and development of faculty and staff for more meaningful and active involvement in extension and community development activities.

As a component or office within the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, it is logical to assume that RCAC should assume a major responsibility for the on-going professional development of university faculty and staff to enhance their capabilities for translating research into practice and for designing and implementing viable community-based community development projects throughout rural America.

Faculty need to be trained to employ the new technologies of intervention and adult education, to understand the psychology of adult learning, the social psychology of group interaction, resistance to change, and growth, and to design non-traditional systems of education and learning which reformulate knowledge so that it is functional, immediately relevant, and of high utility in need assessment-problem solving activities at the community level.

18. RCAC should exercise a leadership role in seeing that information on noteworthy accomplishments is disseminated through the media of the professional literature and the popular press and that information on progress, opportunities and needs is brought to the attention of appropriate legislative

committees (state and national) and funding agencies (public and private).

19. RCAC should sponsor a follow-up evaluation in one year to determine activities generated to date; impact of the current evaluation findings and recommendations (if adopted); new or emerging needs and problems; and promising practices.

E. APPENDIX

SUMMARY OF ATTITUDINAL DATA ON RCAC

Institution: Consortium Summary

Scale: Strongly Agree=5; Agree=4; Undecided=3; Disagree=2; Strongly Disagree=1

Item	Mean Response
1. The upper level administration of the university (president, vice presidents and deans) have a clear conception of the objectives of RCAC.	4.31
2. It is essential that they do.	4.71
3. Most of the faculty of the university has a clear conception of RCAC's objectives.	3.18
4. It is essential that they do.	4.17
5. Most of the students at this university have a clear conception of RCAC's objectives.	2.31
6. It is essential that they do.	3.74
7. The RCAC project is recognizable by the institution's administration as a valuable catalyst.	3.97
8. RCAC has played an important role in helping this institution secure more funding for improving the quality of life in common.	3.74
9. My institution has taken full advantage of the opportunities of development afforded to it by RCAC.	3.46
10. The RCAC central staff needs to be more aggressive in stimulating member consortium schools to make requests of RCAC services and resources.	4.03
11. Communication between the central RCAC staff and the local consortium school is sufficiently open and regular.	3.94
12. Communication between the various local consortium schools about RCAC-type activities is sufficiently open and regular.	3.12

13.	The RCAC effort is simply a duplication of what is already normally being done by the university itself.	2.35
14.	There is an urgent and continuing need for RCAC-type projects within the various consortium member schools.	4.34
15.	RCAC is a major factor in member institution's staff development programs.	3.40
16.	RCAC efforts will result in a residual force of trained proposal writers and creative program designers if given sufficient time and money.	4.05
17.	The RCAC thrust toward education training programs, technical assistance, and certain types of financial aid has been an effective procedure for accomplishing the objective of the effort.	3.71
18.	The central RCAC staff is aware of and sensitive to consortium member institutions' needs and wants.	3.85
19.	The central RCAC staff should be expanded so that more effective liason can be established between it and the member institutions.	4.29
20.	The quality of proposals generated at the institution since RCAC's inception has improved.	3.74
21.	Given sufficient time, the dollars invested in RCAC will be returned many fold by institution improved capacity to attract public and private funds via proposal development.	4.29
22.	There are evidence to suggest that the RCAC effort, with member institutions, is having both direct and indirect impacts on improving the quality of life in the community.	4.18

ERIC Clearinghouse
JUL 17 1973
on Adult Education